



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,010	08/22/2003	Timothy E. Hoglund	03-0084	8967
7590	10/19/2006			
EXAMINER				
GANDHI, DIPAKKUMAR B				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2138		
DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/646,010	HOGLUND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dipakkumar Gandhi	2138	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. Applicants' request for reconsideration filed on 9/26/2006 has been reviewed.
2. The amendment filed on 9/26/2006 has been entered.
3. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nance et al. (US 5,715,197) in view of Conner (US 4,450,560).

As per claim 1, Nance et al. teach a method for observing the state of internal signals, comprising: receiving specific signals by a plurality of multiplexers in at least one module; combining by the plurality of multiplexers, signals received to create a plurality of signals; receiving, by mapping logic, one of said plurality of signals from each one of said plurality of multiplexers; and mapping, by said mapping logic, one of said plurality of signals to any one of a plurality of outputs of said mapping logic (fig. 1, 2, col. 3, lines 33-39, col. 4, lines 36-38, col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 32, col. 7, lines 45-46, Nance et al.).

However Nance et al. do not explicitly teach the specific use of chip testing and test signal groups.

Art Unit: 2138

Conner in an analogous art teaches that the invention features in one aspect apparatus for testing LSI and memory devices by injecting test signals (col. 1, lines 31-33, Conner). Conner also teaches a group sequence generator for causing the format and timing generator to provide updated format and timing information corresponding to groups of the test signals and the standards for testing the memory devices (col. 1, lines 55-59, Conner).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nance et al.'s patent with the teachings of Conner by including an additional step of using the test signal groups.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that using the test signal groups would provide the opportunity to simultaneously analyze the test signals.

- As per claim 2, Nance et al. and Conner teach the additional limitations.

Nance et al. teach the method wherein the at least one module includes a plurality of modules (fig. 1, col. 3, lines 33-35, Nance et al.).

- As per claim 5, Nance et al. and Conner teach the additional limitations.

Nance et al. teach the method further comprising: said mapping logic including a plurality of mapping multiplexers; each one of said plurality of mapping multiplexers receiving said plurality of signals; each one of said plurality of mapping multiplexers generating a different one of said plurality of outputs of said mapping logic; and each one of said plurality of mapping multiplexers selecting one of said plurality of signals to output (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 36-41, Nance et al.).

Conner teaches test signal groups (col. 1, lines 55-59, Conner).

- As per claim 6, Nance et al. and Conner teach the additional limitations.

Nance et al. teach the method wherein said mapping logic is byte lane mapping logic (col. 2, lines 15-17, Nance et al.).

- As per claim 8, Nance et al. and Conner teach the additional limitations.

Nance et al. teach a system for observing the state of internal signals, comprising: means for receiving specific signals by a plurality of multiplexers in at least one module; the plurality of multiplexers combining

Art Unit: 2138

the specific signals received to create a plurality of signals; mapping logic for receiving one of said plurality of signals from each one of said plurality of multiplexers; and said mapping logic mapping one of said plurality of signals to any one of a plurality of outputs of said mapping logic (fig. 1, 2, col. 3, lines 33-39, col. 4, lines 36-38, col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 32, col. 7, lines 45-46, Nance et al.).

Conner teaches chip testing and test signal groups (col. 1, lines 31-33, col. 1, lines 55-59, Conner).

- As per claim 9, Nance et al. and Conner teach the additional limitations.

Nance et al. teach the system wherein the at least one module includes a plurality of modules (fig. 1, col. 3, lines 33-35, Nance et al.).

- As per claim 12, Nance et al. and Conner teach the additional limitations.

Nance et al. teach the system further comprising: said mapping logic including a plurality of mapping multiplexers; each one of said plurality of mapping multiplexers receiving said plurality of signals; each one of said plurality of mapping multiplexers generating a different one of said plurality of outputs of said mapping logic; and each one of said plurality of mapping multiplexers selecting one of said plurality of signals to output (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 36-41, Nance et al.).

Conner teaches test signal groups (col. 1, lines 55-59, Conner).

- As per claim 13, Nance et al. and Conner teach the additional limitations.

Nance et al. teach the system wherein the mapping logic is byte lane mapping logic (col. 2, lines 15-17, Nance et al.).

7. Claims 3, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nance et al. (US 5,715,197) and Conner (US 4,450,560) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Swart (US 5,389,885).

As per claim 3, Nance et al. and Conner substantially teach the claimed invention described in claim 2 (as rejected above).

However Nance et al. and Conner do not explicitly teach the specific use of the method, further comprising: concurrently observing test signals for a plurality of modules.

Swart in an analogous art teaches that electrical test signals...under test (col. 8, line 65 to col. 9, line 2, Swart).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nance et al.'s patent with the teachings of Swart by including an additional step of using the method, further comprising: concurrently observing test signals for a plurality of modules.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that using the method, further comprising: concurrently observing test signals for a plurality of modules would provide the opportunity to compare test signals output from different modules and analyze the signals.

- As per claim 10, Nance et al., Conner and Swart teach the additional limitations.

Swart teaches the system, further comprising: concurrently observing test signals for a plurality of modules (col. 8, line 65 to col. 9, line 2, Swart).

8. Claims 4, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nance et al. (US 5,715,197), Conner (US 4,450,560) and Swart (US 5,389,885) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Moore et al. (US 5,604,432).

As per claim 4, Nance et al., Conner and Swart substantially teach the claimed invention described in claim 3 (as rejected above).

However Nance et al., Conner and Swart do not explicitly teach the specific use of the method, wherein the plurality of modules includes identical modules.

Moore et al. in an analogous art teach that it is desirable to be able to use the same test vectors for identical modules (col. 4, lines 43-44, Moore et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nance et al.'s patent with the teachings of Moore et al. by including an additional step of using the method, wherein the plurality of modules includes identical modules.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that using the method, wherein the plurality of modules includes identical modules would provide the opportunity to compare the test signal output simultaneously from the identical modules.

- As per claim 11, Nance et al., Conner, Swart and Moore et al. teach the additional limitations.

Art Unit: 2138

Moore et al. teach the system wherein the plurality of modules includes identical modules (col. 4, lines 43-44, Moore et al.).

9. Claims 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nance et al. (US 5,715,197) and Conner (US 4,450,560) as applied to claim 1, 8 above, and further in view of Wittig et al. (US 6,118,300).

As per claim 14, Nance et al. and Conner substantially teach the claimed invention described in claim 1 (as rejected above). Conner also teaches test signal groups (col. 1, lines 55-59, Conner).

However Nance et al. and Conner do not explicitly teach the specific use of the method further comprising: mapping, by said mapping logic, a first one of said plurality of signals, which was received from a first one of said plurality of multiplexers, to a first one of said plurality of outputs of said mapping logic to output as a first output; mapping, by said mapping logic, a second one of said plurality of signals, which was received from a second one of said plurality of multiplexers, to a second one of said plurality of outputs of said mapping logic to output as a second output; and said first one of said plurality of signals and said second one of said plurality of signals being a same signal type of signal.

Wittig et al. in an analogous art teach that FIG. 2A illustrates a wide multiplexer...output port OUT (fig. 2B, col. 5, lines 59-65, Wittig et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nance et al.'s patent with the teachings of Wittig et al. by including an additional step of using the method further comprising: mapping, by said mapping logic, a first one of said plurality of signals, which was received from a first one of said plurality of multiplexers, to a first one of said plurality of outputs of said mapping logic to output as a first output; mapping, by said mapping logic, a second one of said plurality of signals, which was received from a second one of said plurality of multiplexers, to a second one of said plurality of outputs of said mapping logic to output as a second output; and said first one of said plurality of signals and said second one of said plurality of signals being a same signal type of signal.

Art Unit: 2138

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to output desired test signals using a mapping logic.

- As per claim 15, Nance et al., Conner and Wittig et al. teach the additional limitations.

Wittig et al. teach the system further comprising: said mapping logic mapping a first one of said plurality of signals, which was received from a first one of said plurality of multiplexers, to a first one of said plurality of outputs of said mapping logic to output as a first output group; said mapping logic mapping a second one of said plurality of signals, which was received from a second one of said plurality of multiplexers, to a second one of said plurality of outputs of said mapping logic to output as a second output group; and said first one of said plurality of signal groups and said second one of said plurality of signal groups being a same signal type of a signal (fig. 2B, col. 5, lines 59-65, Wittig et al.).

Conner teaches test signal groups (col. 1, lines 55-59, Conner).

Art Unit: 2138

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dipakkumar Gandhi whose telephone number is 571-272-3822. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Dipakkumar Gandhi
Patent Examiner



ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100